

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 3, 6 to 8, 10 to 12, and 15 to 18 are pending.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 6 to 8, 10 to 12, and 15 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0048142 (“Marusak”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,140 (“Larson”), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,739,737 (“Hatton”).

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claim 1 has been rewritten to provide the feature that *the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator*. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, as explained below, and Figures 1 and 2.

Claim 1, as presented, relates to a vehicle electrical system powered by a battery to supply a plurality of loads. The vehicle electrical system of claim 1, as presented, includes an integrated module positioned between a positive terminal of the battery and the plurality of loads, the integrated module having a terminal at which a generator is connectable, and in which *the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator*.

The Marusak, Larson, and Hatton references do not disclose (or even suggest) the feature that the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator, as provided for in the context of claim 1, as presented. The Final Office Action admits at page 3 that the Marusak reference does not teach or suggest the feature of “an electronics unit for diagnosis of the generator,” but argues at page 2 of the Final Office Action that the feature of “an electronics unit for at least one of regulation” is found in the Marusak reference, stating that “the recited ‘regulation’ could be any kind of regulation, for example, of the battery [since only] diagnosis of the generator is positively claimed.” However, the present application makes clear in both the Specification and Figures 1 and 2 that the feature of *regulation and diagnosis of the generator*, is correctly interpreted to mean *regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator*. (Specification, p. 5, line 6; p. 7, lines 5 to 11; and p. 10, lines 26 to 32). While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claim 1 has been rewritten to explicitly provide this feature. Nowhere does the Marusak reference mention regulation of the generator or diagnosis of the generator. Therefore, the Marusak reference

does not disclose (or even suggest) the feature that *the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator*, as provided for in the context of claim 1, as presented.

Further, the Larson reference also does not disclose (or even suggest) the feature that the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator, as provided for in the context of claim 1, as presented. However, the Final Office Action at page 4 asserts that Larson discloses this feature, stating “col. 3 lines 43-53 describes how ESC 30, in combination with other controllers, execute a battery management program that regulates and diagnoses the battery 1 pack by making adjustments to the generator output. Since the battery is directly connected to the generator, the generator output is also effectively diagnosed.” However, the Larson reference does not disclose (or even suggest) regulation of a generator and diagnosis of a generator. The Larson reference merely refers to a conventional alternator which provides a constant D.C. voltage output of 42.0 volts. (Larson, col. 5, lines 31 to 37; Figures 2 and 3, elements 15 and 115). Further, the Larson reference only states that “a controllable voltage regulator 21 [is] used for regulating the recharging of battery pack 25.” (Larson, col. 3, lines 41 to 42).

Thus, the Larson reference refers to a controllable voltage regulator that receives constant voltage from the alternator and merely controls the voltage sent to the battery for recharging. (Larson, col. 4, lines 25 to 40; col. 6, lines 47 to 49; and col. 6, lines 56 to 60). Nowhere does the Larson reference refer to an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator, as provided for in the context of claim 1, as presented. In addition, while the Final Office Action at page 8 asserts that “the battery is coupled to the generator,” the Larson reference only indicates that the state of the battery may be diagnosed, but does not disclose that the alternator is regulated or diagnosed by an electronics unit. (Larson, col. 3, line 49).

Therefore, the Larson reference does not disclose (or even suggest) the feature that *the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator*, as provided for in the context of claim 1, as presented.

In addition, the Hatton reference does not disclose (or even suggest) the feature that the integrated module further includes an electronics unit for at least one of regulation of the generator and diagnosis of the generator, as provided for in the context of claim 1, as

presented. As explained above, the Marusak and Larson references do not disclose (or even suggest) all of the features of claim 1, as presented. The Hatton reference does not cure - and is not asserted to cure - the critical deficiencies of the Marusak and Larson references.

Therefore, the proposed combination of the Marusak, Larson, and Hatton references does not render unpatentable claim 1 for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as presented, is allowable. Claims 2, 3, 6 to 8, 10 to 12, and 15 to 18 ultimately depend from claim 1, as presented, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as presented.

Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

In sum, claims 1 to 3, 6 to 8, 10 to 12, and 15 to 18 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims 1 to 3, 6 to 8, 10 to 12, and 15 to 18 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections (and any objections) be withdrawn, since all issues raised have been addressed and obviated. An early and favorable action on the merits is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/31/2008

By: 

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

1457706